

REMARKS**Interview held June 30, 2011**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her kindness and assistance during a brief Interview, which was held on June 30, 2011 between the Examiner, Mr. Rick Holzgrafe, Mr. Christopher Radcliffe, Ms. Juliette Hirt, and Applicant's representative, Michael A. Glenn.

During the Interview, Applicant discussed the Daniele reference relied upon by the Examiner in connection with a rejection under 35 USC § 103. In particular, Applicant noted that the Examiner gave no weight to Applicant's claim limitation to a "document server," and that the claimed invention is readily distinguished from Daniele with regard to the document server and client logic device. In particular, Daniele prints a glyph onto a document. The glyph is used at a copy machine to permit copying of the document. Daniele lacks Applicant's client logic device and document server and, thus, cannot provide Applicant's first and second user viewable versions of a specific document that resides at the document server.

Applicant understands that the Examiner agreed that Daniele did not render the claimed invention to be obvious. Applicant also understands that, subject to her supervisor's approval, the Examiner is now ready to allow the application. If Applicant's understanding is incorrect, Applicant asks that the Examiner understand that there is no intent on Applicant's part to misrepresent the substance of the Interview and that Applicant has only endeavored in good faith to provide an accurate and faithful recitation of facts concerning the Interview as Applicant understands them.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 1 – 3, 15, 17 – 21, 55 – 75, and 78 – 86 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US patent number 5,444,779 (Daniele) alone, and not in view of other art.

As noted above, Daniele does not teach key claim limitations and, as such, is not deemed to teach the claimed invention to the skilled person.

Applicant notes the extremely long pendency of this application, now over 11 years! The application has now been through several rounds of prosecution and has been the subject of several searches by the Examiner. This submission is Applicant's third submission without claim amendment, which means that the Examiner will now have considered these exact claims three times once she has reviewed this submission. Applicant is of the opinion that the Examiner has, commendably, conducted a thorough and exhaustive examination of this application. As such, the next appropriate step would be to allow the application to pass to issuance as U.S. Letters Patent.

Should The Examiner deem it helpful, she is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176
Customer No. 22862